

**DRAFT**

**INITIAL STUDY/  
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION  
CRESTLINE PARK AND RIDE FACILITY  
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

*Prepared for:*

**SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS  
825 East 3rd Street  
San Bernardino, California 92415-0835**

*Prepared by:*

**CHAMBERS GROUP, INC.  
302 Brookside Avenue  
Redlands, CA 92373**

**January 2005**

**Draft**  
**MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**  
**Crestline Park and Ride Facility**

San Bernardino County  
Department of Public Works  
825 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0835

**PROPOSED FINDING**

Based upon the information contained in the Initial Study, the County of San Bernardino finds that there would not be a significant effect to the environment because the mitigation measures described herein would be incorporated as part of the project. The facts supporting this finding are presented in the attached Initial Study.

**PROJECT PROPONENT**

San Bernardino County Department of Public Works

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The County of San Bernardino is proposing to construct a 36-space Park and Ride facility in the unincorporated community of Crestline on the south side of Lake Drive, approximately 280 feet west of Forest Shade Road. The project site is a vacant lot, approximately 80 feet by 158 feet, located adjacent to and east of an existing bowling alley.

Construction would take approximately 45 days. The existing structures on the site, including concrete foundations, block wall, fencing, and signs would be removed. Seven existing mature trees would be removed from the site. Concrete retaining walls would be constructed at the rear of the parking lot, approximately 20 feet from the rear property line, and along the east and west property lines. The following construction equipment would be used:

- Back-hoe with jack hammer attachment for removal of existing concrete and asphalt from the site;
- Dump truck to haul away existing material and import new fill dirt to site;
- Front end loader for hauling and shaping the dirt on the property;
- Asphalt paving machine;
- Asphalt rollers; and
- Concrete truck or portable mixer for retaining walls.

**PROJECT LOCATION**

As shown in Figures 1 and 2 of the attached Initial Study, the proposed project is located in the community of Crestline in San Bernardino County, California.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES INCORPORATED INTO THE PROJECT TO AVOID POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

### **Aesthetics**

- A-1: As required in the County's Plant Protection and Management Ordinance (Title 8, Division 9, Chapter 1, Section 20), a minimum of 20 percent of the lot shall be left in a natural undeveloped, vegetated or revegetated condition that maintains or establishes the forest environment with sufficient vegetative coverage as determined by the reviewing authority. At least one-half (1/2) of such natural areas shall be located in the front yard area or located such that significant portions are visible from the public thoroughfare on which the improvements are to be located.

### **Biological Resources**

- B-1: Prior to construction activities, silt fencing, hay wattles (certified free of weeds), and sand bags shall be placed between the construction site and the creek to avoid any impacts from run off. In addition, project personnel will be instructed to avoid the creek and adjacent riparian areas.
- B-2: The proposed project shall comply with the County of San Bernardino Plant Protection and Management Ordinance (County of San Bernardino Development Code, Title 8, Division 9).
- B-3: If construction is to occur between March 1 through July 30, a survey to identify raptor nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more that two weeks before the start of construction. Active raptor nests located within 500 feet of the construction area will be mapped, and construction will be delayed within 500 feet of such a nest until a qualified biologist determines that the subject raptor(s) are no longer nesting or until juveniles have fledged.

### **Noise**

- N-1: Construction shall only be permitted between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday. No work shall be permitted on Sundays or Federal holidays.
- N-2: All equipment used at the site shall be fitted with manufacturer-approved mufflers in good working condition.
- N-3: The construction contract documents shall require compliance with Caltrans' standard specification Section 7-1.011, "Sound Control Specifications."

### **INITIAL STUDY PREPARED BY:**

CHAMBERS GROUP, INC.  
302 Brookside Avenue  
Redlands, CA 92373

**FILING DATE:** February 1, 2005

**PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD:** February 1, 2005 to March 3, 2005

**DATED:** January 28, 2005

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Crestline Park and Ride Facility

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**

San Bernardino County Department of Public Works  
825 East 3rd Street  
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0835

3. **Contact Person and Telephone Number:**

Frank Molina  
Supervising Planner  
(909) 387-8109  
Fax (909) 387-8130

4. **Project Location**

The proposed project is located in the community of Crestline within the San Bernardino National Forest, in San Bernardino County, California (Figure 1). The project site is located south of Lake Drive between Sleepy Hollow Cabins and the Crestline Bowling Alley approximately one mile east of Highway 138 and 1.5 miles north of Highway 18 (Figure 2).

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address**

San Bernardino County Department of Public Works  
825 East 3rd Street  
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0835

Contact: Frank Molina, Supervising Planner

6. **General Plan Designation:** Crest Forest/General Commercial

7. **Zoning:** CF/CG-SCp (Crest Forest/General Commercial – Sign Control Overlay District)

8. **Description of Project:**

The County of San Bernardino is proposing to construct a 36-space Park and Ride facility in the unincorporated community of Crestline on the south side of Lake Drive, approximately 280 feet west of Forest Shade Road. The project site is a vacant lot, approximately 80 feet by 158 feet, located adjacent to and east of an existing bowling alley (Figure 3).

Construction would take approximately 45 days. The existing structures on the site, including concrete foundations, block wall, fencing, and signs would be removed. Seven existing mature trees would be removed from the site. Concrete retaining walls would be constructed at the rear of the parking lot, approximately 20 feet from the rear property line, and along the east and west property lines. The following construction equipment would be used:

- Back-Hoe with jack hammer attachment for removal of existing concrete and asphalt from the site;
- Dump truck to haul away existing material and import new fill dirt to site;

## FIGURE 1 – REGIONAL MAP

## FIGURE 2 – VICINITY MAP

## FIGURE 3 – SITE PLAN

- Front end loader for hauling and shaping the dirt on the property;
- Asphalt paving machine;
- Asphalt rollers; and
- Concrete truck or portable mixer for retaining walls.

## 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The project site consists of a partially paved vacant lot in a commercial area. Several large trees and concrete building foundations are located on the site. The site is surrounded by residential and commercial land uses. Local businesses such as the Tactical Survey Group, Sleepy Hallow Cabins, and the Crestline Bowling Alley are located north, east, and west of the site, respectively. Lake Gregory Regional Park is located 0.25 mile east of the site. A portion of Houston Creek and some residential areas exist south of the project site.

## 10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approvals Are Required:

Agency	Permit or Approval
County of San Bernardino	Conditional Use Permit; Tree removal under County plant protection and management ordinance
Regional Water Quality Control Board	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) approval

## Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics            | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality     | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality           | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning       | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources  | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources           | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources    | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils     | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing      |   |

## Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. ☐

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. ☒



I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. ☐

I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. ☐

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required. ☐

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

San Bernardino County Public Works Dept.  
Agency

## I. AESTHETICS

The proposed project is located in the community of Crestline within the San Bernardino National Forest. The surrounding areas of the site are commercial, residential, and recreational in nature. The project site is located between the Crestline Bowling Alley and the Sleepy Hollow Cabins Motel within a forest downtown setting.

The proposed project includes the construction of a 36-space Park and Ride facility located south of Lake Drive, a County-designated scenic highway within the Crest Forest Planning Area (County of San Bernardino 1989, as amended). Currently, several mature trees exist within the proposed site including Houston Creek, which runs along the southern boundary of the property. The onsite trees were evaluated for possible bark beetle infection and were determined to be free of infection. The surrounding trees were also evaluated and signs of bark beetle infection were not present. The site is partially paved with dispersed vegetation. Several structures exist on the site, including concrete foundations, block wall, fencing, and signs.

a)	Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project is located in the community of Crestline in the County of San Bernardino in a commercial/residential area. The proposed project involves the construction of a Park and Ride facility and additional site improvements including planters. Seven mature trees would be removed as part of the project (Section IVe provides a discussion of the San Bernardino County tree removal ordinance). The proposed project would result in the removal of trees and a loss of a scenic resource along Lake Drive. The project proposes to preserve the largest pine tree located along Lake Drive. When constructed, the project would be consistent with the commercial/residential nature of the surrounding land uses, many of which have been partially cleared for the placement of buildings and parking. A less than significant impact would occur with incorporation of Mitigation Measure A-1.

### Mitigation Measure:

A-1: As required in the County's Plant Protection and Management Ordinance (Title 8, Division 9, Chapter 1, Section 20), a minimum of 20 percent of the lot shall be left in a natural undeveloped, vegetated or revegetated condition that maintains or establishes the forest environment with sufficient vegetative coverage as determined by the reviewing authority. At least one-half (1/2) of such natural areas shall be located in the front yard area or located such that significant portions are visible from the public thoroughfare on which the improvements are to be located.

b)	Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project is not located within a state scenic highway; however, it is located along Lake Drive, a County-designated scenic highway. See the response to a) above.

c)	Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project involves the construction of a Park and Ride facility and additional site improvements. The proposed Park and Ride facility would be visible from Lake Drive and surrounding land uses and would not be substantially different from surrounding commercial land uses as it consists primarily of a parking lot. However, the removal of large trees would change the visual character of the site and its surroundings. This impact would be less than significant with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure A-1.

d)	Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

There is not current source of light at the project site. The only light in the vicinity of the site is a security light adjacent to the western portion of the site used which belongs to the bowling alley and minimal street lighting. The proposed project does not include any additional lighting; a less than significant impact would occur.

## II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

The project site, located in the community of Crestline, has not been mapped on the Important Farmlands Map for San Bernardino County. The site is not located on agricultural land nor is it under a Williamson Act contract. There are no local policies for agricultural resources that apply to the project site.

a)	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The California Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Important Farmlands Map for San Bernardino County indicates that the proposed site is not mapped (Natural Resources Conservation Service 1998). The proposed project is located in a forest downtown community setting surrounded by commercial and residential land uses. Because the proposed project would not convert farmland to non-agricultural use and no agricultural areas exist in the vicinity of the project, no impacts would occur.

b)	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site is zoned General Commercial. The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract; therefore, the project would not result in a conflict with an agricultural zoning designation or a Williamson Act contract.

c)	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would include the construction of a Park and Ride facility. The project site is located in a commercial area and would not result in offsite changes to the environment, which would result in the conversion of such farmland to non-agricultural use.

### III. AIR QUALITY

The project site is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) manages air quality in the basin. The SCAB does not attain state and federal ambient air quality standards for three of six criteria air pollutants: carbon monoxide, ozone, and suspended particulate matter (particulate matter with a diameter equal to or less than 10 microns). The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has also designated the SCAB as a maintenance area for the federal nitrogen dioxide standard. The Crestline area in which this project is located has the highest ozone concentrations in the SCAB. This project is intended to decrease traffic and the resultant air pollutant emissions in the SCAB.

a)	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The implementation of this project would result in short-term construction emissions. The construction activities would include the demolition of concrete pavement, building foundations, and retaining walls at the site; hauling away of the demolition debris; grading of the site with the use of fill material brought onsite; paving of the new parking lot; and construction of a new retaining wall. Construction would be completed within 45 days of commencing. Emissions during construction would result from use of construction equipment; off-site construction worker traffic; fugitive dust from grading activities; and volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from the use of asphalt to pave the parking lot. None of these emissions would exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds for daily emissions. Operation of the facility would actually assist in the implementation of the applicable air quality plan by reducing commuter traffic and the associated emissions.

b)	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

As discussed above, the project would result in short-term construction emissions, which would not exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds. The operation of the facility would result in a decrease in emissions from commuter traffic.

c)	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please see the response to Question IIIb.

d)	Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Construction of the new parking lot would cause temporary air emissions related to grading, construction equipment and vehicle exhaust, and VOC emissions from the application of asphalt paving. These impacts would be temporary and are not expected to exceed SCAQMD daily threshold values. Therefore, sensitive receptors would be exposed to less than significant pollutant concentrations.

e)	Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Odors would result from the exhaust of diesel construction equipment and from VOC emissions during asphalt paving. However, these emissions and odors would occur during a short period of time (i.e., about 45 days).

#### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

a)	Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A California Natural Diversity Data Base Search (CNDDB) and a California Native Plant Society (CNPS) database search, as well as a reconnaissance-level biological resources survey, have been conducted to evaluate resources on and adjacent to the project site. Results from the database search revealed that one species of concern has been recorded within two miles of the project site. In addition, several other species have the potential to inhabit portions of the site near Houston Creek.

The project site supports potential habitat for three plants and five wildlife species, as listed in Table 1. Although marginal habitat exists on the project site for these species, these habitats are disturbed by frequent human activity and are unlikely to support these species. Areas adjacent to Houston Creek that support disturbed riparian habitats would not likely be disturbed during construction for the proposed project. Impacts could occur if run off from project construction entered the creek and adjacent riparian habitat. This impact would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure B-1.

**Table 1**  
**Sensitive Species Potentially Using the Proposed Project Site**

Common Name <i>Scientific Name</i>	Status	PFO	Habitat
<b>PLANTS</b>			
Palmer's mariposa lily <i>Calochortus plameri</i> var. <i>palmeri</i>	Federal: FSOC State: none CNPS: 1B	L	Inhabits meadows and seeps in yellow-pine forests and chaparral between 600 and 2,245 meters (1,970 and 7,365 feet) elevation msl.
Plummer's mariposa lily <i>Calochortus plummerae</i>	Federal: none State: none CNPS: 1B	L	Inhabits coastal scrub, chaparral, and valley and foothill grasslands on rocky and sandy soils between 90 and 1,610 meters (295 to 5,280 feet) elevation msl.
San Bernardino Mountains owl's-clover <i>Castilleja lasiorhyncha</i>	Federal: none State: none CNPS: 1B	L	Inhabits meadows, upper montane forests, and chaparral between 1,135 and 2,390 meters (3,725 and 7,850 feet) elevation msl.
<b>WILDLIFE</b>			
California red-legged frog <i>Rana aurora draytonii</i>	Federal: T State: CSC	L	Inhabits areas near permanent sources of water with dense riparian vegetation.
mountain yellow-legged frog <i>Rana muscosa</i>	Federal: E State: CSC	L	Inhabits areas within a few feet of water.
southern rubber boa <i>Charina bottae umbratica</i>	Federal: FSOC State: T	L	Found only in the San Bernardino and San Jacinto Mountains near streams or wet meadows with loose, moist soils.
bald eagle <i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	Federal: T State: E	L	Nests in large old-growth trees with open branches, especially ponderosa pines.
white-eared pocket mouse <i>Perognathus alticola alticola</i>	Federal: T State: CSC	L	Inhabits ponderosa and Jeffrey pine habitats on loose soils in the San Bernardino Mountains.
<b>Status Codes</b> <b>Federal</b> E = Federally listed, Endangered T = Federally-listed, Threatened <b>FSOC</b> = Federal Species of Concern <b>State</b> T = State listed; Threatened E = State listed; Endangered <b>CSC</b> = California Species of Special Concern <b>CNPS</b> 1B = Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere 2 = Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California but more common elsewhere		<b>Potential for Occurrence (PFO, see text for full explanation of criteria):</b> <b>L = Low potential for use</b> - No recent records exist or the species occurring in the project area or its immediate vicinity (within approximately 2 miles) and the diagnostic habitat requirements strongly associated with the species do not occur in the project area or its immediate vicinity.	

#### **Mitigation Measure:**

- B-1: Prior to construction activities, silt fencing, hay wattles (certified free of weeds), and sand bags shall be placed between the construction site and the creek to avoid any impacts from run off. In addition, project personnel will be instructed to avoid the creek and adjacent riparian areas.

b)	Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A riparian corridor exists within the project site along Houston Creek. Impacts to this community could occur if run off from project construction entered the creek or adjacent riparian areas. This impact can be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure B-1 listed above.

c)	Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Houston Creek, located on the project site, is likely subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and the California Department of Fish and Game, under Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code. Permits would likely be required from these agencies and the Regional Water Quality Control Board for any potential impacts to the creek. Impacts can be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure B-1 listed above.

d)	Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Houston Creek may serve as a natural wildlife corridor, but is unlikely to be a significant source of regional wildlife movement because of its location in the center of the developed area of the community of Crestline, supporting continuous human presence, and associated presence of domestic predators such as dogs and cats.

e)	Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

To complete this project, the removal of seven native trees is proposed, including oaks (*Quercus* sp.), Jeffery pines (*Pinus jefferyi*), and incense-cedars (*Calocedrus decurrens*). In order to comply with the County of San Bernardino's tree ordinance, approval must be obtained by the County for the removal of any native tree exceeding 6 inches in stem diameter, with a greater than 19-inch circumference, or of a height greater than 4.5 feet above ground level (County of San Bernardino

2001). All of the trees proposed for removal on the site fall under the conditions that require a permit from the County. Additionally, the native trees on the site are the largest trees in the immediate area and may provide nesting habitat for numerous bird species, including raptors. Impacts associated with the removal of these trees can be mitigated to be less-than-significant by incorporating Mitigation Measures B-2 and B-3.

**Mitigation Measures:**

B-2: The proposed project shall comply with the County of San Bernardino Plant Protection and Management Ordinance (County of San Bernardino Development Code, Title 8, Division 9).

B-3: If construction is to occur between March 1 through July 30, a survey to identify raptor nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than two weeks before the start of construction. Active raptor nests located within 500 feet of the construction area will be mapped, and construction will be delayed within 500 feet of such a nest until a qualified biologist determines that the subject raptor(s) are no longer nesting or until juveniles have fledged.

f)	Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site lies within the boundaries of the San Bernardino Valley Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan and the San Bernardino National Forest Plan area. However, the project site is not within proposed conservation areas of either of these plans.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

A record search for the project area was conducted with the San Bernardino Archaeological Information Center at the San Bernardino County Museum in Redlands, California. The search identified all previous investigations and all archaeological sites and properties listed or determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and/or the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) located within a 1-mile radius of the project area.

The record search indicated that four previous cultural resources studies have been conducted within a 1-mile radius of the project area. None of these investigations resulted in the identification of any archaeological or architectural resources within or near the project area. The most recent of the studies, an archaeological and architectural survey conducted in 2002, included all of the project area (Hatheway et al. 2002). Because this survey covered the entire project area a new cultural resources field survey of the project area is not considered necessary for this project.



a)	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

One historic-age resource, the Sleepy Hollow Cabins/Motel containing nine separate buildings that were constructed in the 1930s, is located adjacent to the project area. This resource was evaluated for eligibility to the NRHP and CRHR in 2002 and was determined to not meet the criteria for eligibility to either register (Hatheway et al. 2002). Furthermore, the project would not result in any alterations to any of the nine buildings associated with the motel. Because no properties listed on or eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR are located within or near the project area, no such resources would be impacted by the proposed project. No mitigation measures are required.

b)	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The record search identified no archaeological sites that have been previously recorded within or near the project area. A field survey of the entire project area was conducted in 2002 and no archaeological sites were identified (Hatheway et al. 2002). Therefore, there would be no impacts to any archaeological sites from the proposed project. No mitigation measures are required.

c)	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

A paleontologic literature and records review for the project area was conducted by the Curator of Paleontology in the Division of Geological Sciences of the San Bernardino County Museum in Redlands, California. This review consisted of a search of the Regional Paleontologic Locality Inventory (RPLI) to identify known fossil localities in the vicinity of the project area, as well as an examination of geologic maps of the region to assess the potential of the project area to contain significant paleontologic resources. The search of the RPLI has determined that there are no known paleontologic resources recorded within or near the project area. In fact, no paleontologic resources have been recorded for several miles in any direction of the project area. Furthermore, geologic maps of the region indicate that the project area is located on fan deposits of recent age (i.e., late Holocene) overlying Mesozoic granitic rocks associated with Silverwood Lake. Both of these rock units are considered to have a low potential to contain significant nonrenewable paleontologic resources (Scott 2003). Therefore, no impacts to paleontologic resources are expected from the proposed project and no mitigation measures are required.

d)	Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No formal cemeteries are known exist in the project area and no human remains were identified in the project area during the 2002 cultural resources survey (Hatheway et al. 2002). A search of the Sacred Lands file conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento, California determined that there are no known Native American resources in the project area, including human burial sites (Wood 2003). Therefore, no impact is anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

## VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The project site is located in an area where several faults are capable of generating large to moderate earthquakes. The San Andreas Fault system poses geologic and seismic hazards in the project area including fault rupture and ground shaking that could in turn cause slope instability. The San Andreas Fault is located approximately five miles southwest of the site. Other faults near the site include the Cleghorn Fault and the Waterman Canyon Fault located approximately two miles north and south from the site, respectively (Southern California Earthquake Center 2003).

Soils in the project area consist of the Oak Glen family of soils which consist of very deep, well drained soils on alluvial fans and drainageways at elevations of 3,200 to 6,500 feet. Slopes range from 2 to 30 percent. These soils consist of well-drained sandy loam and have a moderately rapid permeability and a moderate potential for erosion (Johnson 2003).

a)	Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i)	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site is located approximately five miles northeast of the San Andreas Fault. The proposed project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo special study fault zone (County of San Bernardino 1989b). The proposed project does not include any structures. Thus, the Park and Ride facility would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects related to these hazards.

ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project would not expose people or structures to strong ground shaking greater than what currently exists. Impacts would be less than significant.

iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project is not located within a known liquefaction area, and it is unlikely for the project to be affected by seismic related ground failure greater than what currently exists. Impacts would be less than significant.

iv)	Landslides?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The site is not located in an area with landslide susceptibility (San Bernardino County General County Plan 1989b). The proposed project would place a Park and Ride facility in a developed commercial area. The risk of landslides would not be significant.

b)	Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Soils in the project area consist of the Oak Glen family of soils which consist of well-drained sandy loam that have a moderately rapid permeability and a moderate potential for erosion (Johnson 2003). These soils have a low shrink swell potential.

Earthwork grading is proposed to remove existing structures on the site, including concrete foundations, block wall, fencing, and signs. Seven existing mature trees would be removed from the site. The entire site would be paved except for the southern portion of the site and the gravel base and planters surrounding the parking area.

Drainage improvements would be constructed on the southern end of the site to control stormwater flows from entering Houston Creek. These improvements include concrete retaining walls approximately 20 feet from the rear property line, and along the east and west property lines along with a three-foot wide concrete gutter that would be constructed along the center of the site.

In addition, an 8-inch curb and gutter would be added along Lake Drive. Stormwater flows would be held by the concrete retaining walls and allowed to percolate through a gravel base into the soil before draining to the creek. The proposed project would not result in the removal of soils from the site. Soils in the project area would be temporarily exposed to erosion during construction. Once construction is complete, the site would be paved and the added drainage improvements would help control erosion at the southern end of the site. A less than significant impact would occur.

c)	Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site is located approximately five mile northeast of the San Andreas Fault. The site is located in an area with no landslide susceptibility, and is not located in an area subject to liquefaction. The construction of the project would not result in lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

d)	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Soils in the project area consist of the Oak Glen family of soils which consist of well-drained sandy loam that have a moderately rapid permeability and a moderate potential for erosion. These soils have a low shrink swell potential. A less than significant impact would result.

e)	Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would not require water or sewer service, septic tanks, or alternative wastewater disposal.

## VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

An Initial Site Assessment (ISA) Checklist was conducted by the County of San Bernardino in April 2002. It was determined that the site did not have potential hazardous waste involvement.

a)	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Some hazardous materials, such as diesel fuel, would be used at the site during construction. The transport of hazardous materials is regulated by the State and the transport of such materials to the site would be in compliance with all State regulations. These materials would only be present during construction and would be removed upon completion of the project. With prevention and management programs in place, impacts from construction-related spills of hazardous materials are considered less than significant.

b)	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Some hazardous materials, such as diesel fuel, would be used during construction. These materials would only be present during construction and would be removed upon completion of the project. The site use as a parking lot is not expected to result in or contribute to the risk of hazardous materials exposure. With prevention and management programs in place, impacts from construction-related spills of hazardous materials are considered less than significant.

c)	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

There are no schools located within one-quarter mile of the proposed project. Crestline High School is located approximately one mile southwest of the project site. No impacts to the school would occur.

d)	Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project is not on a list of known hazardous materials sites (State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control 1998).

e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public or private airport.

f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

g)	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Project activity would not alter emergency response or emergency evacuation routes. Roadways would not be blocked during construction or operation.

h)	Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project is located in a Fire Safety Review Area 2 (FR2):

FR2 areas are relatively flat, and are either partially or completely developed, or, if they are not developed, are usually suitable for development. Present and future development within FR2 areas are exposed to the impacts of wildland fires and other natural hazards primarily due to their proximity to Fire Area 1 (County of San Bernardino 2001).

The proposed project includes a Park and Ride facility and no structures would be built on the site. The project site would be used as a carpool area with users primarily present in the morning and in the evenings. Existing site debris and several trees would be removed. However, the risk of fire would not be different than what currently exists with implementation of the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

## VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

a)	Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A significant impact would not occur because the project would not result in an increase in development density. The proposed project does not involve the use of or discharge of water and would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The proposed

project would be subject to State Water Resources Control board (SWRCB) requirements including National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) requirements. With prevention and management programs in place, impacts would be less than significant.

b)	Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project involves the construction of a Park and Ride facility which would result in paving the majority of the site. A portion of the site is currently paved and other signs of building pads and structures exist on the site. The southern portion of the site would not be paved. Concrete retaining walls would be constructed to hold water and allow it to percolate through a gravel base into the ground. The project does not involve the use of groundwater and, therefore, the project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. No impacts would occur.

c)	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project site currently drains to the south towards Houston Creek. Portions of the site are currently paved and other signs of building pads and structures exist on the site. The existing grade of the site would be raised to match the adjacent bowling alley parking lot. Drainage improvements would be constructed on the southern end of the site to control stormwater flows from entering Houston Creek. These improvements include concrete retaining walls approximately 20 feet from the rear property line, and along the east and west property lines. Stormwater flows would be held by the concrete retaining walls and allowed to percolate into the ground through a gravel base before draining to the creek.

Site drainage would be altered during and after construction. Soils in the project area would be temporarily exposed to erosion during construction. Once construction is complete, the site would be paved except for the southern portion of the site and the added drainage improvements would help control erosion. A less than significant impact would occur.

d)	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or offsite?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please see the response to Question VIIIc.

e)	Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would not contribute to substantial amounts of runoff water or contribute to polluted runoff. Drainage improvements as proposed would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site. The drainage improvements however, would work to control erosion of the site and reduce the risk of flooding. A less than significant impact would result.

f)	Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project involves the construction of a Park and Ride facility and additional site improvements including drainage improvements. Some required earthwork (grading) would be required. The proposed project is not expected to degrade water quality.

g)	Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site is located within a 100-year flood hazard area (County of San Bernardino 1989b). However, the project would not place housing in this area, therefore, no impacts would occur.

h)	Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project site is located within a 100-year flood hazard area (County of San Bernardino 1989b). Refer to response to Question VIIIc.



i)	Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project is located in the floodplain for Lake Gregory and Houston Creek. However, the proposed project does not involve any structures. Because the grade would be raised, the flood risk would be reduced.

j)	Would the project inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Seiche, tsunami, or mudflow are not hazards in the project area. The project would not expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

## IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

The County of San Bernardino General Plan land use designation for the proposed project is Crest Forest/General Commercial (CF/CG) (Gallardo 2003). The General Commercial land use designation is defined in the County of San Bernardino General Plan as areas used for stores, offices, service establishments and amusement, offering a wide variety of commodities and services (County of San Bernardino 1989a).

The proposed project is considered an Additional Use as specified in Chapter 4, Division 4 – Land Uses, Section 84.0410(c) of the County of San Bernardino Development Code. Additional Uses are allowed in the General Commercial District as specified in Chapter 3, Division 4, Section 84.0350(c)(7), subject to a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) unless otherwise determined by the County of San Bernardino Planning Officer that the proposed project does not require a CUP.

The County of San Bernardino zoning designation for the project area is the same as the General Plan land use designation and includes the Sign Control (SC[p]) Overlay. The purpose of this overlay district is to regulate freestanding signs in order to insure compatibility with the character of the area. The [p] suffix prohibits primary freestanding signs greater than 18 square feet (County of San Bernardino 2001, as amended)

The project site is surrounded by commercial and residential land uses including the Houston Creek to the south.

a)	Would the project physically divide an established community?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project would not divide an established community. The use would be consistent with adjacent commercial uses.

b)	Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project is located in a General Commercial zone within the Crest Forest Planning Area. The proposed project is considered an Additional Use as defined by the County of San Bernardino Development Code. Additional Uses are allowed in the General Commercial District as specified in Chapter 3, Division 4, Section 84.0350(c)(7), subject to a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) unless otherwise determined by the County of San Bernardino Planning Officer that the proposed project does not require a CUP. A less than significant impact would result.

c)	Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site lies within the boundaries of the San Bernardino Valley Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan and the San Bernardino National Forest Plan area. However, the project site is not within proposed conservation areas of either of these plans.

## X. MINERAL RESOURCES

a)	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project is not located within a known mineral resources area. No impacts are anticipated.

b)	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project is not located in an area known to contain mineral resources. No impacts would occur.

## XI. NOISE

The land uses within the study area consist of residential properties to the south of the project, commercial properties (including a motel) on either side of the project site, and more commercial properties to the north of the site across Lake Drive. The primary noise source affecting these properties is traffic on Lake Drive.

In order to document the existing traffic noise environment, measurements were obtained on the project site (Wieland Associates, Inc. 2003). A significant impact would occur if:

- Construction or demolition activities occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or at any time on Sundays or Federal holidays; or
- Equipment with internal combustion engines is not fitted with appropriate, functioning mufflers.

a)	Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Various noise criteria were considered as part of the noise study prepared by Wieland Associates, Inc., including criteria from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, State of California Office of Noise Control, State of California Department of Transportation, and the County of San Bernardino Municipal Code. The proposed project involves the construction of a Park and Ride facility. The generation of noise associated with the proposed project would occur over the short-term (approximately 45 days) for site preparation and construction to implement the proposed project. All construction would occur between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and possibly on Saturdays. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following mitigation measures:

### Mitigation Measures:

- N-1: Construction shall only be permitted between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday. No work shall be permitted on Sundays or Federal holidays.
- N-2: All equipment used at the site shall be fitted with manufacturer-approved mufflers in good working condition.
- N-3: The construction contract documents shall require compliance with Caltrans' standard specification Section 7-1.01I, "Sound Control Specifications."

b)	Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Excessive groundborne vibration is typically caused by activities such as blasting used in mining operations, or the use of pile drivers during construction. The project would not require any blasting activities or pile driving. Impacts would be less than significant.

c)	Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Any potential noise impacts associated with the proposed project would be temporary noise from construction equipment. During the operational phase of the project there would be no increase in ambient noise levels as a result of the project as the cars associated with the Park and Ride facility would be from the local area. Activity would be concentrated in the morning and evening hours and associated traffic noise would be minimal and would result in a less than significant impact.

d)	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

See response to XI (a) and XI (c) above.

e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

There are no airports or private airstrips located near the project. No impacts would occur.

f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts would occur.

## XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

The community of Crestline had a population of 10,218 and contained approximately 6,695 housing units as of January 2000 (County of San Bernardino Demographics 2003). The project site is neighbored by commercial development to the north, east, and west. Residential areas and Houston Creek are located south of the site.

a)	Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. The Park and Ride facility would be used by existing residences and drivers in the area and would add to and improve the existing circulation system. The project would not induce new employment and no new housing would be constructed.

b)	Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No displacement of existing housing units would result from implementation of the proposed project.

c)	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No people would be displaced as a result of the project.

### **XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

The proposed project area would be serviced by the County of San Bernardino Sheriff's Department and the County of San Bernardino Fire Department. The closest fire station is located approximately 0.75 miles southwest from the project site on the corner of Crestline Road and State Highway 138. The second closest fire station is located approximately 1.25 miles northeast of the project site.

Crestline High School, located approximately one mile southwest, is the closest school to the project site. Additionally, the closest post office is located approximately 0.25 mile west while the closest Park and Ride lies 0.75 miles southwest of the proposed project site.

The proposed project lies within the community of Crestline in the San Bernardino National Forest. The closest parks to the site are Crestline Park and Lake Gregory Regional Park located approximately 0.25 mile east of the project site.

a)	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:  Fire Protection? Police Protection? Schools? Parks? Other public facilities?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would not create a substantial new fire or public safety hazard. New employment would not be generated that would affect the demand for schools, parks, or other public facilities. The project would not result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities nor affect response time or other performance objectives.

#### XIV. RECREATION

The project site lies adjacent to a bowling alley and approximately 0.25 miles west of Crestline Park and Lake Gregory Regional Park. The project site is located south of local businesses and alongside of the Sleepy Hallow Cabins within the community of Crestline in the San Bernardino National Forest. Thousand Pines Camp and the Lake Gregory Recreation Area are located less than 0.5 mile north of the site along Thousand Pines Road.

a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project does not involve residential uses and would not cause a direct increase in the population of the project area. The project would add a Park and Ride facility in downtown Crestline that would primarily be used by the people residing in Crestline. A less than significant impact would result.

b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project includes the construction of a Park and Ride facility. The facility would serve the local area and would not result or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

## XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Lake Drive is the main road in Crestline, located adjacent and north of the site. Lake Drive is an undivided, paved two-way road which intersects Forest Shade Road less than 0.25 miles east of the project site. Parking areas are located along Lake Drive which service the local businesses. State Highway 138 and State Highway 18 (The Rim of the World Highway) are located one mile southwest and approximately 1.5 miles south of the proposed project, respectively.

a)	Would the project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would generate a minimal amount of construction traffic during the approximate 45-day construction period. A less than significant impact would result. The project operation would reduce traffic load and daily trips in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system due to the expected increase in users of the Park and Ride facility. The proposed project would reduce traffic emissions along Lake Drive and along intersecting streets such as Forest Shade Road. Implementation of the proposed project would reduce the number of commuters on the mountain roads leading to Crestline, especially State Highway 18, and lead to improved mobility resulting in a beneficial impact.

b)	Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please see the response to Question XVa.

c)	Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would not affect air traffic patterns. It would help to reduce traffic levels in the local area.

d)	Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project does not include the construction of roads. The Park and Ride facility would be designed according to County of San Bernardino development standards such that impacts would be less than significant.

e)	Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project consists of a parking lot with access via Lake Drive. No impacts would result.

f)	Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Crestline currently lacks public parking in the central shopping district, and there is limited parking in front of local businesses along both sides of Lake Drive. The proposed project includes the construction of a Park and Ride facility with 36 parking spaces. The purpose of the Park and Ride facility is to encourage car/van pools and to reduce local traffic congestion and air emissions. In addition, the facility would provide additional off-road parking during off-service hours which may be used by weekend tourists, shoppers, and during holidays reducing congestion along Lake Drive. A driveway connecting the Park and Ride facility and the adjacent bowling alley would be constructed, hence, providing overflow parking capacity for the bowling alley. The proposed project would result in beneficial impacts to parking capacity.

g)	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project does not conflict with adopted transportation policies. The project would implement the following goals of the Regional Transportation Plan: mobility/congestion, air quality improvement, access to alternative modes of transportation, and highway safety.

## XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The proposed project involves the construction of a Park and Ride facility which consists primarily of a parking lot. The proposed project would not require electrical and wastewater services. Solid waste generated during construction of the project would be taken to the Heaps Peak Transfer Station or directly to a Valley area landfill.



a)	Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would not require wastewater service. No impacts would occur.

b)	Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would not require construction of new or expansion of existing water or wastewater services. No impacts would occur.

c)	Would the project require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please refer to the response to Question VIIIc. A less than significant impact would occur.

d)	Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project would not require a water supply from existing entitlements or resources. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

e)	Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project would not require wastewater service. The local wastewater treatment provider would not be affected.

f)	Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The existing structures on the site, including concrete foundations, block wall, fencing, and signs would be removed. Seven existing mature trees would be removed from the site. A less than significant impact would result.

g)	Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. No impact would occur.

## XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment and would not have a significant impact on any fish or wildlife or their habitat with the incorporation of mitigation measures described in this Initial Study. No cultural resources or examples of California history or prehistory would be impacted.

b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project has been found to have less than significant environmental effects after mitigation. The proposed project is not likely to have impacts that are cumulatively considerable.

c)	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project has been found to have less than significant environmental impacts with incorporation of mitigation measures for aesthetics, biology, and noise impacts. Therefore, the project would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

## Sources

County of San Bernardino

2001 Title 8 - Development Code, as amended, September 13, 2001.

(San Bernardino County development ordinances: Chapter 3: Mountain Forest and Valley Tree Conservation sections 89.0315 and 89.0505).

1989a General Plan, as amended. Adopted July 1, 1989. Revised December 21, 2000.

1989b General Plan Hazard Overlay Maps.

County of San Bernardino Demographics

2003 Population of San Bernardino County, accessed at: <http://www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us/demographics.htm>, June 18.

Gallardo, Lisa

2003 Zoning Division, Building and Safety Department, San Bernardino County, personal communication, June 18.

Hatheway, Roger, John Romani, Brendon Biggs, Gene Huey, Tom Sharpe, Wayne Lindberg, Doug Hogue, Harold Zamora, and Ileen Fletcher

2002 *A Cultural Resources Management (CRM) Report and Determination of Eligibility (DOE) Report for Crestline, California Walkway and Façade Improvement Projects*. Prepared for County of San Bernardino Department of Economic and Community Development. Prepared by County of San Bernardino Department of Public Works.

Johnson, Joe

2003 Zone Soil Scientist, USDA Forest Service, Region 5 – Pacific Southwest Region, San Bernardino National Forest, personal and fax communication, June 19.

Natural Resources Conservation Service

1998 Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, San Bernardino California, Important Farmlands Map.

Scott, Eric

2003 Paleontology Literature and Records Review, Crestline Park-And-Ride, Gregory Lake Region, San Bernardino County, California. Prepared by Curaor of Paleontology, Division of Geological Sciences, San Bernardino County Museum, Redlands, California. Prepared for Chambers Group, Inc., Redlands, California.

Southern California Earthquake Center

2003 Cleghorn Fault and the Waterman Canyon Fault, accessed at [www.scecdc.secec.org](http://www.scecdc.secec.org), June.

State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control

1998 Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List (Cortese List), April.

Wieland Associates, Inc.

2003 Draft Screencheck Environmental Noise Study for the Proposed Park and Ride Lot in the City of Crestline. July 28.

Wood, Robert

2003 Letter Report of Findings and Recommendations for the Proposed Park and Ride Facility, Crestline, San Bernardino County, California. Prepared by State of California, Native American Heritage Commission, Sacramento, California. Prepared for Chambers Group, Inc., Redlands, California.

**List of Preparers**San Bernardino County Department of Public Works

Brenden Biggs, PE, Project Manager

Frank Molina, Supervising Planner

Chambers Group, Inc.

Kathy Buescher-Simon, Senior Wildlife Biologist

Janet Chairez, Assistant Environmental Analyst

Evelyn Chandler, Principal Archaeologist

Leslie Hall, Staff Support, Production

Jesus "Freddie" Olmos, Staff Environmental Analyst / Project Manager

Glenn Reed, Air Quality Engineer

Anne Surdzial, AICP, Senior Environmental Analyst